```
1
                 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
 3
                            TYLER DIVISION
 4
    INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC, ) (
 5
                                   ) ( CIVIL ACTION NO.
         PLAINTIFF,
 6
                                   ) ( 6:18-CV-299-JRG
 7
   VS.
                                   ) ( TYLER, TEXAS
 8
                                   ) (
   GREAT WEST CASUALTY COMPANY,
                                  ) ( MARCH 13, 2019
10
                                   ) ( 8:26 A.M.
         DEFENDANT.
11
                   TRIAL TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL
12
             BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE RODNEY GILSTRAP
13
                 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE
14
   FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Mr. Derek T. Gilliland
15
                       Mr. Ty W. Wilson
                       NIX PATTERSON, LLP
                       205 Linda Drive
16
                       Daingerfield, Texas 75638
17
                       Mr. Karl A. Rupp
18
                       NIX PATTERSON, LLP
                       Advancial Tower
19
                       1845 Woodall Rodgers Tower
                       Suite 1050
                       Dallas, Texas 75201
20
21
   COURT REPORTER:
                       Ms. Shelly Holmes, CSR, TCRR
                       Official Court Reporter
22
                       United States District Court
                       Eastern District of Texas
23
                       Marshall Division
                       100 E. Houston
                       Marshall, Texas 75670
24
25
    (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
   produced on a CAT system.)
```

1	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	Mr. Michael J. Bettinger Ms. Irene I. Yang SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP
3		555 California Street Suite 2000 San Francisco, California 94104
4		
5		Mr. Harry Lee Gillam, Jr. GILLAM & SMITH, LLP 303 South Washington Avenue
6		Marshall, Texas 75670
7		Mr. Andrew T. Langford SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP
8		2021 McKinney Avenue Suite 2000 Dallas, Texas 75206
10		Ms. Sharon Lee
11		Mr. Samuel A. Dillon SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP
12		1501 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005
13		Mr. Paul J. Rogerson
14		SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP One South Dearborn Chicago, Illinois 60603
15		0.1.1.0.1.3.0.1.0.1.0.1.0.1.0.1.0.1.0.1.
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
PROCEEDINGS
 1
 2
            (Jury out.)
 3
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
 4
            THE COURT: Be seated, please.
            Let me ask if the parties are prepared to read into
 5
   the record any items from the list of pre-admitted exhibits
 6
7
   used during yesterday's portion of the trial?
            MR. WILSON: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
 9
            THE COURT: All right.
10
            Let's proceed.
11
            MR. WILSON: This is Ty Wilson on behalf of
12
   Intellectual Ventures.
            Plaintiff did not admit any exhibits in the --
13
   yesterday's portion of the trial.
14
15
            THE COURT: All right.
16
            MR. ROGERSON: And this is Paul Rogerson on behalf
17
   of Defendant, Great West. Yesterday, on March 12th, 2019,
18
   Great West admitted the following exhibits: GWX-198,
   GWX-204, GWX-230, and GWX-261.
19
20
            THE COURT: Is there any objection from Plaintiff
   to that rendition from Defendant?
21
22
            MR. WILSON: No, Your Honor.
23
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel.
24
            Before I bring the jury in and proceed with the
25
   Court's final instructions to the jury, I just want to
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

```
remind those present, including those behind the bar, that
   closing arguments, together with the Court's final
   instructions, are the most serious part of a very serious
   process.
            Therefore, I don't want any noise. I don't want
   any shuffling of papers. I don't want any people getting up
   and walking around. I certainly don't want to see water
   bottles tilted in the air. I want everybody to be as
   respectful and as quiet as possible.
            So if you need to do any of those things I just
   mentioned, do them before I bring the jury in, because once
   I bring the jury in, I expect everybody to be as respectful
   and quiet and focused as possible so as not to detract or
   distract the jury from either my final instructions or
   counsel's closing arguments.
            With that, are there any questions or issues that
   need to be raised by either party before I bring the jury
   in?
            MR. GILLILAND: The only thing, Your Honor, is
   I'm probably going to use the flip chart with closing
   argument. Where would you like me to position it?
            My -- my thought, Your Honor, is if I can put it to
23
   the right of the podium, and hopefully, Mr. Bettinger will
   be able to see it.
```

25 I don't intend to use it very many times, but that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
would avoid me from having to walk back and forth too many
times, but wherever Your Honor would like me to put it.
        THE COURT: Well, I'd like -- I expect counsel to
be within the close proximity of the podium. Sometimes we
talk about it being the arm's length rule. I don't want you
to be further than that.
        One thing I will mention to you that I did not know
the first time I tried a case in this courtroom, and that is
that podium swivels. And if you want to turn it
45 degrees so that it's facing the jury box, as opposed to
the direction in which it's faced now, we can do that. We
don't need to be moving it back and forth.
        Do either of you have any preference as to whether
we leave it where it is or whether we orient it toward the
jury?
        MR. BETTINGER: Either way is fine, Your Honor.
        MR. GILLILAND: Same -- same here, Your Honor.
Either way is fine. I was just trying to figure out where I
could place the flip chart so --
        THE COURT: Quite honestly, if we swivel it, it may
be easier for you to have the flip chart closer to the
podium.
        MR. GILLILAND: Can we do that now, or when do you
want us to try?
        THE COURT: I think Mr. Gillam is skilled at that
```

```
1
   particular move.
 2
            Do you want to move the podium?
            MR. GILLILAND: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
            THE COURT: Let's do that.
 4
            MR. BETTINGER: Are you going to use the ELMO
 5
   because I think you can push that in --
 6
 7
            MR. GILLILAND: Should I move the flip chart now,
   Your Honor?
 8
            THE COURT: Let's see -- let's put it where you
   think you're going to put it.
10
11
            Ms. Lockhart, can you help them with that?
12
            Just a minute, gentlemen.
            All right. Let's go off the record for a minute.
13
            (Off the record discussion.)
14
15
            THE COURT: Let's go back on the record.
16
            All right. Let's bring in the jury, please.
17
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise for the jury.
18
            (Jury in.)
            THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
19
20
            Please have a seat.
21
            Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you have now
   heard the evidence in this case, and I'll now instruct you
22
23
   on the law that you must apply. I want you to understand
24
   that you're each going to have your own written copy of
25
   these final instructions to the jury from me to take with
```

you and to reference in the jury room when you retire to deliberate. So unless you just particularly want to, there's no need for you to make notes while I give these to you orally since you're going to have your own hard copy when you deliberate.

It's your duty, ladies and gentlemen, to follow the law as I give it to you. On the other hand and as I've said previously, you are the sole judges of the facts in this case.

Do not consider any statement that I have made during the course of the trial or may make as a part of these instructions as an indication to you that I have any opinion about the facts in this case.

You're about to hear closing arguments from the attorneys. Statements and arguments from the attorneys, I remind you, are not evidence, and they are not instructions on the law. They're intended only to assist the jury in understanding the evidence and the parties' competing contentions.

A verdict form has been prepared for you. You'll take this verdict form with you to the jury room, and when you have reached a unanimous decision as to the verdict, you'll have your foreperson fill in the blanks in the verdict form reflecting your unanimous answers, sign it, and date it.

Your foreperson should then notify the Court Security Officer that you have reached a verdict.

Answer each question in the verdict form from the facts as you find them to be. Do not decide who you think should win the case and then answer the questions to reach that result.

Again, your answers and your verdict must be unanimous.

Now, in determining whether any fact has been proven in this case, you may, unless otherwise instructed, consider the testimony of all the witnesses, regardless of who may have called them, and you may consider the effect of all the exhibits received into evidence, regardless of who produced them.

As I've told you, you, the jury, are the sole judges of the credibility and believability of each and every witness, as well as the weight and effect to give to all of the evidence in this case.

As I've also mentioned previously, the attorneys in this case are acting as advocates for their competing clients, and they have competing claims, and they have a duty to object when they believe evidence is offered or argument is made that should not be permitted by the Court. That's happened over the course of the trial, and I've ruled on those objections.

In the situation where the Court has sustained an objection to a question addressed to a witness, you must disregard the question entirely, and you may draw no inferences from its wording or speculate about what the witness would have said if the Court had allowed them to answer the question.

However, on the other hand, if an objection addressed to a witness regarding a question was overruled by the Court, then you're to treat the question and the answer just as if no objection had been made.

Now, at various times over the course of the trial, it's been necessary for the Court to talk to the lawyers here at the bench or outside of your hearing when you were in the jury room. This happens during trials because there are often things that arise that do not directly impact or affect the jury.

You should not speculate, ladies and gentlemen, about what was said during those discussions that took place outside of your presence.

Now, you should understand that there are two types of evidence that you may properly consider in finding the truth as to the facts in this case.

One type of evidence is called direct evidence, such as the testimony of an eyewitness.

The other is indirect or sometimes called

circumstantial evidence, which is the proof of a chain of circumstances that indicates the existence or non-existence of certain other facts.

As a general rule, you should understand that the law makes no distinction between direct evidence or indirect evidence but simply requires that you, the jury, find the facts based on the evidence presented during the trial, both direct and indirect.

Now, in this case, the parties have stipulated or agreed to some facts in this case. When the lawyers for both sides stipulate as to the existence of a fact, you must, unless otherwise instructed by me, accept that stipulation as evidence and regard those facts as proven.

Also, over the course of the trial, certain testimony has been presented to you through a deposition. A deposition is a sworn, recorded answers to questions asked of a witness in advance of the trial.

If a witness can't be present in person to testify in open court, then the witness's testimony, which has been recorded under oath previously, can be played back to the jury in the form of a deposition.

During a deposition, the witness is present, the witness is sworn, and placed under oath -- placed on oath, and a court reporter is present, and lawyers for both of the parties are there. Questions are asked by the attorneys,

and answers are given by the witness. And those questions and answers are recorded.

That deposition testimony is entitled to the same consideration by you insofar as possible as if the witness had testified in person from open court. And, accordingly, you should judge the credibility and importance of deposition testimony to the best of your ability, just as if the witness had testified before you from the witness stand.

Now, while you should consider only the evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, you should understand that you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and the exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience.

In other words, you may make deductions, and you may reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts that have been established by the testimony and the evidence in the case.

However, you should not base your decision on any evidence that -- evidence that was not presented during the trial in open court, including your own personal experiences with any particular web portals.

Now, unless I instruct you otherwise, you may properly determine that the testimony of a single witness is sufficient to prove any fact, even if a greater number of witnesses may have testified to the contrary, after

considering all of the evidence you believe that single witness.

When knowledge of a technical subject may be helpful to the jury, a person who has special training and experience in that technical field, we call them an expert witness, is permitted to state his or her opinions on those technical matters to the jury.

However, ladies and gentlemen, you're not required to accept the opinions of any expert witness or any other witness for that matter.

It's up to you to listen to their testimony and decide whether you want to give it weight, and if -- if so, what degree of weight you want to give their testimony.

Again, you are the sole judges of the credibility and believability of all the witnesses and the evidence in this case.

Also, over the course of the trial, certain exhibits have been shown to you which are called demonstratives. These are illustrations that sometimes are used to help a party describe or picture or model something that's involved in the trial.

If your recollection should differ from these demonstratives, sometimes called demonstrative exhibits, you should rely on your memory, your recollection.

Demonstrative exhibits are not evidence. They are sometimes

called jury aids.

And while the demonstrative itself is not evidence, the witness's testimony during which time the demonstrative is used is evidence.

Again, you will have to rely on your memory of the evidence in the case. But demonstratives that have been used by the -- during the trial are not evidence, and I cannot send them to you -- to the jury room if you should ask for them.

Now, in any legal action, facts must be proven by a required amount of evidence known as the burden of proof.

The burden of proof in this case is on the Plaintiff for some issues, and it's on the Defendant for other issues. And there are two burdens of proof that you will apply in this case.

Those are the preponderance of the evidence and clear and convincing evidence.

The Plaintiff, Intellectual Ventures, who you've heard referred to as IV or Intellectual Ventures, has the burden of proving patent infringement by a preponderance of the evidence.

Intellectual Ventures, the Plaintiff, also has the burden of proving damages for any patent infringement by a preponderance of the evidence.

A preponderance of the evidence means the evidence

that persuades you that a claim is more probably true than not true. This is sometimes talked about as being the greater weight and degree of credible testimony.

Now, the Defendant in this case, Great West
Casualty Company, who you've heard referred to consistently
as simply Great West, has the burden of proving patent
invalidity by clear and convincing evidence.

Clear and convincing evidence means evidence that produces in your mind an abiding conviction that the truth of the party's factual contentions are highly probable.

Now, although proof to an absolute certainty is not required, the clear and convincing evidence standard requires a greater degree of persuasion than is necessary for the preponderance of the evidence standard.

If the proof establishes in your mind, ladies and gentlemen, an abiding conviction in the truth of the matter, then the clear and convincing evidence standard has been met.

Now, these standards are different from what you've heard about in criminal proceedings where a fact must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

On a scale of standards of proof, as you move from the preponderance of the evidence on one end to clear -- to beyond a reasonable doubt on the other end of the spectrum, you can consider clear and convincing evidence as being

somewhere in between.

Now, in determining whether any fact has been proven by a preponderance of the evidence or by clear and convincing evidence, you may -- you may, unless otherwise instructed by me, consider the stipulations of the parties, the testimony of all the witnesses, regardless of who called them, and all the exhibits received into evidence during the trial, regardless of who produced them or introduced them during the trial.

Now, as I did at the start of the case, I'll give you a summary of each side's contentions, and I'll then provide you with detailed instructions on what each side must prove to win on each of its contentions.

As I've previously told you, this case concerns one single United States patent, that is, U.S. Patent

No. 7,516,177, which you've heard referred to throughout this trial as the '177 patent, sometimes called the patent-in-suit or the asserted patent.

Now, this patent has within it Claim 14 of this '177 patent, and the Plaintiff claims that Claim 14 of the asserted patent has been infringed by the Defendant. And the Plaintiff is seeking money damages because of this alleged infringement.

Now, the Defendant denies that it has infringed Claim 14 of the '177 patent, and the Defendant contends

additionally that Claim 14 is invalid.

Your job is to decide whether the Plaintiff has proven that the Defendant has infringed Claim 14 of the patent-in-suit and whether Defendant has proven that Claim 14 is invalid.

Infringement and invalidity, ladies and gentlemen, are separate questions and should be considered and answered separately.

If you decide that Claim 14 of the '177 patent has been infringed and is not invalid, then you'll need to decide any money damages that are to be awarded to Plaintiff to compensate it for that infringement.

Now, at the beginning of the trial, I gave you some general information about patents and the patent system and a brief overview of the patent laws relevant to this case.

I'll -- I'll now give you more detailed instructions about the patent laws that relate to the case before us.

Before you can decide many of the issues in this case, you need to understand the role of the patent claims.

The patent claims are those numbered sentences at the end of the patent. And each of you have a complete copy of the '177 patent in your juror notebooks.

The claims, ladies and gentlemen, are important because it's the words of the claims that define what a patent covers.

The figures and the text in the rest of the patent provide a description and examples of the invention, and they provide a context for the claims, but it is the claims that define the breadth of the patent's coverage.

Each claim is effectively treated as if it were a sep -- a separate patent, and each claim may cover more or less than any other claim.

Accordingly, what a patent covers depends, in turn, what each of its claims covers.

Now, claims may describe methods or products such as machines or processes for making or using a product. In this case, Claim 14 is what's called an apparatus claim.

Patent claims may exist in two forms, referred to as independent claims and dependent claims. In this case, Claim 14 is a dependent claim.

An independent claim does not refer to any other claim in the patent. An independent claim sets forth all the requirements that must be met in order to be covered by that claim. Therefore, it's not necessary to look at any other claim to determine what an independent claim covers.

On the other hand, a dependent claim does not itself recite all the requirements of the claim but refers to at least one or more other claims for some of its requirements. In this way, the claim depends from another claim.

And a dependent claim incorporates all the requirements of the claim or claims to which it refers, or as we sometimes say, from which it depends. A dependent claim then adds its own additional requirements to those claims to which it refers.

Now, to determine what a dependent claim covers, it's necessary to look at both the dependent claim and any other claims to which it refers.

Each patent claim sets forth in words a set of requirements in a single sentence. The requirements of a claim are usually divided into parts, sometimes called elements or limitations.

If a device, system, apparatus, or instrumentality satisfies each of these requirements in the claims' sentence, then it's said that the device, system, or apparatus, or instrumentality is covered by the claim and falls within the claim or infringes the claim.

For example, a claim that covers an invention of a table may recite within the claim itself a tabletop, four legs, and the glue to secure the legs to the tabletop.

In this example, the tabletop, the legs, and the glue are each separate limitations or elements of the claim.

Now, the beginning portion, called the preamble of a claim, often uses the word "comprising." The word "comprising," as used in the preamble of a claim, means

including or containing.

When comprising is used in the preamble, a product that includes all the limitations or elements of that claim, as well as additional elements, is covered by the claim.

For example, a claim to a table, again, comprising a tabletop, legs, and glue would be infringed by a table that includes a tabletop, legs, and glue, even if it also includes wheels on the ends of the legs or some other structure.

If a product is missing even one limitation or element required in the claim, then it does not meet all the requirements of the claim and is not covered by the claim.

If a product is not covered by the claim, then it does not infringe the claim.

Now, you first need to understand each claim term in order to decide whether or not there is infringement of a claim and decide whether or not the claim is invalid.

The law says that it's my role as the Judge to define the terms within the claims, and it's your role to apply my definitions to the issues that you're asked to decide in this case.

Therefore, as I explained to you at the beginning of the case, I've already determined the meanings of some of the language within the claims, and I've provided those definitions to you in the chart that's included in your

juror notebooks. You must accept those definitions that

I have given you as to those words within the claim as being correct.

It's your job to take those definitions and apply them to all the issues that you are deciding, including the issues of infringement and invalidity.

Now, for any words within the claims for which I did not provide you with a definition or construction, you should apply those terms' plain and ordinary meaning as understood of one of ordinary skill in the art, which is to say in the field of the technology of the patent at the time of the invention of the '177 patent.

Now, the meaning of the words of the patent claims must be the same when deciding the issues of infringement and when deciding the issue of invalidity.

My interpretation of the language should not be taken as an indication that I have a view regarding these issues as to infringement and invalidity.

Those decisions, ladies and gentlemen, are yours to make. And during your deliberations, you must apply the constructions and definitions that I have given you.

As I mentioned, these are set forth in the chart included in your juror notebook, but I'm going to go over with them -- with you -- I'm going to go over them with you briefly now.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
The following term has been construed by the Court.
This term or phrase from the claim is "centralized access
point of a user."
        The Court's construction is: A user's network
resource that can be used to access content.
        Another term, phrase, or clause from the claim that
the Court has construed is "distributed info" --
"distributed information access point."
        The Court's construction or definition, which I've
supplied to you for that term, is: A network resource which
is delivered to one or more users and that enables a user to
interact with a centralized access point.
        An additional term which the Court has construed
for you is "administrative interface."
        The construction or definition I've supplied to you
for that term is: A software management tool that
facilitates administrative functions.
        Also, another term that I have construed or defined
for you is "manage any content."
        The construction or definition that I've supplied
to you for that term is: Manage one or more stored content.
        Now, with that, I'll instruct you on the specific
rules that you must follow to determine whether the
Plaintiff has proven that the Defendant has infringed
Claim 14 of the '177 patent.
```

To prove infringement, the Plaintiff, Intellectual Ventures, must persuade you that it is more likely than not that the Defendant, Great West, has infringed Claim 14.

You must decide whether the Defendant has made or used within the United States a product covered by the asserted claim.

You must compare Claim 14 of the '177 patent to the accused product to determine whether every requirement of the claim is included in the accused product.

To prove infringement, Plaintiff must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant made or used within the United States an accused product that includes each and every limitation of Claim 14.

In determining whether the accused product infringes Claim 14, you must compare the accused product with each and every requirement recited in the claim.

A claim requirement is present if it exists in the accused product as I have explained the language of the requirement to you, or if I did not explain it, as it would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

If the accused product omits even a single requirement or claim, then you must find that the accused product does not infringe that claim.

In patent law, a system, device, method, publication, or patent that predated the patent claim at

1 issue is called prior art.

Prior art may include items that were publicly known or that have been used or offered for sale or references, such as publications or patents, that disclose the claimed invention or elements of the claimed invention.

To be prior art, an item or reference must have been made, known, used, published, patented, or filed as a patent application before the priority date of the patent-in-suit.

Defendant has challenged the validity of Claim 14 as anticipated by the prior art. Patent invalidity, ladies and gentlemen, is a defense to patent infringement.

Now, even though the U.S. Patent and Trademark

Office and the examiner assigned to this patent by that

office has allowed Claim 14 of the '177 patent, you, the

jury, have the ultimate responsibility of deciding whether

Claim 14 is valid.

I'll now instruct you on the rules that you must follow in deciding whether the Defendant, Great West, has proven that Claim 14 of the '177 patent is invalid.

To prove that Claim 14 is invalid, the Defendant must persuade you by clear and convincing evidence that the claim is invalid.

Now, during the course of the trial, the Defendant has presented you with prior art. In considering that prior

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
art, you may consider whether the prior art was or was not
already considered by the Patent Office before granting the
patent.
        Prior art differing from the prior art considered
by the Patent Office may, but does not always, carry more
weight than the prior art that was considered by the Patent
Office.
        However, as I've told you, it's your job as the
jury to determine the amount of weight, if any, to give to
all of the evidence in this case.
        The fact that any particular piece of prior art was
or was not considered by the Patent Office does not change
the Defendant's burden of proof.
        Claims are construed the same way for determining
infringement as for determining invalidity.
        In this case, the priority date for the
patent-in-suit, the '177 patent, is May the 11th, 2000.
        Now, a number of issues relevant to invalidity must
be viewed from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill
in the art, that is, in the field of the asserted invention
as of the effective filing date of the
'177 patent.
        It's up to you to -- to decide the level of
ordinary skill in the field of the invention. You should
```

consider all the evidence introduced at trial in making this

decision, including: 1 2 (1) the levels of education and experience of persons working in the field; 3 (2) the type of problems encountered in the field; 4 (3) prior art solutions to those problems; 5 (4) speed with which innovations are made; 6 7 and, (5), the sophistication of the technology. A person of ordinary skill in the art is a 8 hypothetical person who is presumed to have known all of the 9 relevant prior art at the time of the claimed invention. 10 In order for someone to be entitled to a patent, 11 12 the invention must actually be new. In general, an invention is new when the identical product or process has 13 not been made, used, or disclosed before. 14 If an invention is not new, it is considered to be 15 16 anticipated. 17 Here, the Defendant contends that Claim 14 is 18 invalid because it is anticipated. Defendant must persuade you by clear and convincing evidence. 19 20 Defendant may prove anticipation by proving that: 21 (1) the invention was known or used by others in 22 this country or patented or described in a printed 23 publication or in this or a foreign country before the 24 '177 patent; 25 (2) the invention was patented or designed in a

```
printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country more than one year prior to the date of the application of the '177 patent in the United States;
```

- (3) the invention was publicly used, sold, or offered for sale in the United States more than one year prior to the date of the application for the '177 patent;
- (4) the invention was described in a published application for a patent by another filed in the United States before the '177 patent;
- or, (5), the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States and the application was filed before the '177 patent.

For a claim to be invalid because it is not new, all of its requirements must have existed in a single system that predates the '177 patent or must have been described in a single printed publication or patent that predates the '177 patent.

Now, to understand how a patent -- excuse me, to understand how a prior art system operates, you may rely on multiple pieces of evidence to describe -- that describe the same prior art system for the purpose of finding anticipation.

In other words, if you find that a single prior art

system existed that meets every element of the claim, then that is enough to find that the claim is invalid as anticipated by the prior art.

The prior art must contain all of the limitations or elements of the claim arranged as in the claim.

The Defendant must prove by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 14 was anticipated by the prior art.

If you find that the Defendant has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 14 was anticipated by the prior art, as I've explained the law to you, you must find that Claim 14 is invalid.

If you find that the Defendant has failed to prove by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 14 was anticipated by any prior art, then you must find that Claim 14 is not anticipated.

Now, in determining whether or not the invention of Claim 14 is invalid, you must determine the scope and content of the prior art at the time the invention was made.

For prior art to anticipate a claim of a patent, the disclosure in the prior art reference does not have to be in the same words as the claim, but all the elements of the claim must be there, either stated or necessarily implied so that someone of ordinary skill in the field of the invention looking at that reference would be able to make and use at least one embodiment of the claimed

invention.

Anticipation can occur when the claimed invention inherently or necessarily results from the practice of what is disclosed in the written reference, even if the inherent disclosure was unrecognized or unappreciated by one of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.

If you find, ladies and gentlemen, that Claim 14 is not new, as I have explained it to you, you should find it to be invalid.

If you find that the Defendant has infringed Claim 14 and Claim 14 is not invalid, then you must decide and consider the proper amount of damages, if any, to award to the Plaintiff.

I'm not suggesting which party should win on any issue. If you find that the Defendant has not infringed Claim 14 or that Claim 14 is invalid, then -- then the Defendant is not -- excuse me, then the Plaintiff is not entitled to any damages.

If you award damages, they must be adequate to compensate the Plaintiff for any infringement of Claim 14 -- 14 that you may find.

You must not award the Plaintiff more damages than are adequate to compensate for the infringement, nor should you include any additional amount for the purpose of punishing the Defendant. Damages are not meant to punish an

1 infringer.

Your damages award, if you reach this issue, should put Plaintiff in approximately the same financial position that it would have been in had the infringement not occurred.

Plaintiff has the burden to establish the amount of its damages by a preponderance of the evidence.

In other words, you should award only those damages that the Plaintiff establishes that it more likely than not suffered as a result of the Defendant's infringement of Claim 14 of the '177 patent.

Now, while the Plaintiff is not required to prove the amount of its damages with mathematical precision, it must prove them with reasonable certainty.

A Plaintiff is not entitled to damages that are remote or speculative. The patent laws specifically provide that damages for infringement may not be less than a reasonable royalty.

A reasonable royalty is the amount of royalty payment that a patentholder and the alleged infringer would have agreed to in a hypothetical negotiation taking place at a time immediately prior to when the infringement first began.

In considering this hypothetical negotiation, you should focus on what the expectations of the patentholder

and the alleged infringer would have been if they'd entered into an agree -- into an agreement at that time and had they acted reasonably in their negotiations.

In determining this, you must assume that both parties believed Claim 14 of the patent-in-suit was valid and infringed and that both parties were willing to enter into an agreement.

The reasonable royalty that you determine must be a royalty that would have resulted from the hypothetical negotiation and not simply a royalty that either party would have preferred.

As I've said, in this case, the Plaintiff seeks a reasonable royalty. A reasonable royalty must be in the form -- excuse me, a reasonable royalty may be in the form of a lump-sum amount where the patent owner receives a single, upfront payment as the royalty payment. You must be careful to ensure that the award is no more or no less than the value of the patented invention.

The patent law does not allow you to use the patent of an entire product or service or the value of the entire market to determine the damages unless you find that the Plaintiff has proved that the patent feature of the product drives the consumer demand for the entire product or service.

Evidence of things that happened after infringement

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

```
began can be considered in evaluating the reasonable
   royalty, only to the extent that the evidence aids in
   assessing what the royalty would have resulted -- what
   royalty would have resulted from the hypothetical
   negotiation.
            In this case, the parties generally agree on when
   and between whom the hypothetical negotiation for Claim 14
   of the '177 patent would have taken place.
            The parties also generally agree that the
   hypothetical negotiation would have resulted in a single
   lump-sum royalty for the life of the patent.
            In determining the reasonable royalty, you should
   consider all the facts known and available to the parties at
   the time the infringement began.
            Some of the kinds of factors you may consider in
   making your determination are:
            (1) the royalties received by the Plaintiff for
   licensing of the '177 patent, proving or tending to prove an
   established royalty;
            (2) the nature and scope of the license as
   exclusive or non-exclusive or as restricted or
22
   non-restricted in terms of territory or with respect to whom
23
   the manufactured product may be sold;
            (3) the duration of the patent and the term of the
   license;
```

- (4) the utility and advantages of the patented property over the old modes or devices, if any, that have been used for working out similar results;
- (5) the nature of the patented invention and the character of the commercial embodiment of it as owned or produced by the licensor and the benefits to those who have used the invention;
- (6) the extent to which Defendant has made use of the invention and any evidence probative of the value of that use;
- (7) the portion of the realizable profits that should be credited to the invention as distinguished from the non-patented elements, the manufacturing process, business risks, or similar features or improvements added by the Defendant;
 - (8) the opinion and testimony of qualified experts;
- (9) the amount that the licensor -- excuse me, a licensor, such as the Plaintiff, and a -- a licensee, such as the Defendant, would have agreed upon at the time the infringement began if both had been reasonably and voluntarily trying to reach an agreement, that is, the amount which a prudent licensee who desired as a business proposition to obtain a license to manufacture and sell a particular article embodying the patented invention would have been willing to pay as a royalty and yet be able to

make a reasonable profit and which amount would have been acceptable by a prudent patentee which was willing to grant a license.

Now, no one of these factors is dispositive, and you can and should consider the evidence that has been presented in this case on each of these factors.

You may also consider, ladies and gentlemen, any other factors that in your mind would have increased or decreased the royalty the infringer would have been willing to pay and the patent owner would have been willing to accept, acting as normally prudent business people.

The law requires that any damages awarded to the Plaintiff correspond to the value of the alleged invention and not the value of features of Defendant's accused web portal that are not covered by Claim 14 of the '177 patent. This is particularly true where as here, the accused product has multiple features and multiple components.

Plaintiff bears the burden of establishing the amounts attributable to the patented feature. That is, Plaintiff must give evidence tending to separate and apportion between the patented features and the unpatented features, and such evidence must be reliable and tangible and not conjectural or speculative.

In determining the amount of damages, you must determine when the damages begin. No damages can be awarded

```
for any infringement that occurred before the date the
1
 2
   patent was issued. Damages commence on the date the
   Defendant began the alleged infringement of Claim 14 of the
 3
    '177 patent.
 4
            Now, with these instructions, ladies and gentlemen,
 5
   we're ready to hear closing arguments from the attorneys in
 6
7
   this case.
            Plaintiff may now present its first closing
 8
   argument to the jury.
 9
10
            Mr. Gilliland, would you like a warning on your
11
   time?
12
            MR. GILLILAND: If I could reserve 10 minutes for
13
   rebuttal and get a three-minute warning on the opening?
14
            THE COURT: So 30 minutes total. When you've used
15
   17 minutes, I'll warn you, and then you'll complete in about
16
   20 minutes with 10 minutes remaining for rebuttal?
17
            MR. GILLILAND: Yes, Your Honor.
18
            THE COURT: Okay. You may proceed with your first
19
   closing argument.
20
            MR. GILLILAND: May it please the Court.
21
            Ladies and gentlemen, first things first. I thank
22
   you very much for your time and attention over these last
23
   few days.
24
            As I said at the beginning of this case, what
25
   you're doing now is the second highest service that a
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
citizen of our country can provide, the first, of course,
being the armed forces. And so thank you for that and thank
you for being a very important part of this very important
process and helping us resolve a big dispute that's been
going on for several years.
        Now, I told you at the beginning of the case that
we're here because the Defendant, Great West, failed to
ensure that it was not infringing someone else's patent and
then refused to accept responsibility for what it had done.
        And we've walked you through the evidence, and
we've proven that to you. This case, as we said at the
beginning, it's about the '177 patent and how the Defendant,
Great West, is using that patent.
        And when you get back to the jury room, there are
going to be three questions that you have to answer, and the
Court went over those -- His Honor went over those with you.
        And the first is a question about infringement.
        The second is a question about validity.
        And then the third is a question about damages.
        And so I'd like to spend a few minutes talking to
you about each of those questions.
        Now, the first question is the one that we bear the
burden of proof on, and that's that burden of proof by a
preponderance of the evidence. And it's the more likely
```

than not. Have we presented evidence that indicates that

```
it's more likely than not the Defendant infringed the
1
 2
   patent?
            And if we can, please bring up Plaintiff's
 3
   Exhibit 1?
 4
            Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 is the patent, which you've
 5
   had in your notebooks all week and which you -- if you
 6
7
   wanted, you can request the actual exhibit back in the jury
 8
   room.
            But the issue in this case and the thing that we
   are all focused on is on the last page, and that's
10
11
   Claim 14. And Claim 14 --
12
            If we can catch Claim 11 with it, as well,
13
   Mr. Cartwright?
            Claim 14, as you've heard, depends from Claim 11.
14
15
   So Claim 14 includes everything from Claim 11 and the
16
   additional requirements of Claim 14.
17
            And this -- as you can see when you read the claims
18
   themselves and when you read the title of the patent, that
   it is not about footballs and soccer balls.
19
20
            It's very specific. It's an apparatus for
21
   distributing content through one or more distributed
22
   information access points to a centralized access point of
23
   the user that then has all of these requirements that you
24
   have to prove or that you have to find, and we have to show
25
   you under the burden of proof.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

information.

And we've shown you all of that, and we've shown you that they can infringe this patent in really two distinct and different ways. You've heard the words thrown to you about a Drivers List By Policy and a Reporting Data Policy. Those are two independent ways that the Defendant's web portal infringes this patent. Either one of those proves infringement. Now, the first one of those, the Drivers List Policy that we've talked about, that's the one where an agent --If we could bring up Exhibit GWX-482, please? The Drivers List Policy is where an agent of Great West can go in and modify, add, or change information about a user. GWX-482 is an exhibit in this case. You can ask for it back in the jury room. You can read how the agent portal operates. And if we go to -- it's physical Page 39 of this document. If we go to 39, it explains all the information about what an agent can do regarding drivers and how they can enter information about them, how they can modify them, order their motor vehicle records, and all of that sort of

And Dr. Smith, he walked you through all of that

```
and how it fits with the claim elements of the patent.
1
 2
   you also heard that all of that information is very
   important because it ties back to underwriting and how much
 3
   risk is Great West taking on when they write insurance for a
   specific driver.
 5
 6
            And so all of that information is -- is the
7
   foundation, essentially, of their business, and that's one
   way they infringe.
 8
            The other way they infringe is when an employee
   logs in to the system.
10
11
            And if we could bring up GWX-484?
12
            Now, this is the second type of infringement or the
13
   second infringement they engage in. And it's when an
   employee uses the portal, when an employee logs in to the
14
   portal and does what's been referred to as a Reporting Data
15
16
   Policy.
17
            And if we could go to physical Page 79?
18
            There you go.
19
            And this is the Report Rate Work list. And
20
   starting on this page and continuing through the next page
21
   and for several pages after that, it describes how an
22
   employee can go in and enter data about miles driven, units,
23
   et cetera.
24
            If we can go to the next page, please,
25
   Mr. Cartwright?
```

And see here at the top of the page, you can see 1 2 where they get to enter all of that information. And there's been some discussion and some dispute about whether 3 or not they're creating new policies or just saving over old 4 policies. But you can see right here -- let me see, if --5 in Item No. 2 where it's describing how it operates, it 6 says: After a report date is selected, some changes occur. 7 8 The availability of the report type, actual estimate, and correction is based on previous report types entered for the 10 selected month. 11 But then it says: The equipment unit count fields 12 and the applicable combined rates are populated. That means that content is already filled in on that form. 13 And when the employee goes in, they're modifying 14 15 content. They're managing the content just like Claim 14 16 requires. And this, GWX-484, is also an exhibit you can 17 18 request, and you can see how the employee portal works. And, again, this is starting around Page 76 that it goes 19 20 through this reporting date of policy. 21 Now, either one of those ways will infringe the 22 patent. And so what evidence did we put on to help 23 demonstrate this to you? 24 Well, we brought in Dr. Smith, and he took the 25 witness stand, and he walked methodically through all of the

claim elements. 1 2 And if we could bring up the -- the Claim 14 slide. And you'll recall this slide from Dr. Smith's 3 4 testimony. And this is -- Dr. Smith broke out each of the elements to make it easier to follow. 5 But the first part here, A through E, preamble 6 7 through E, are the elements of Claim 11, which, you know, as you see in Claim 14, it says the apparatus of Claim 11 with 8 the additional requirement of Claim 14. 10 And Dr. Smith went through and methodically showed 11 where he looked at evidence, where he looked at deposition testimony, where he looked at documents like the two we just 12 13 saw and identified every element that was in Claim 14 for you. And he did that to satisfy our burden of proof that 14 15 the Defendants infringe the patent. 16 And then the -- the Defendants, as -- as you recall, they brought up some issue about whether drivers are 17 18 users. And even Mr. Foote, when he walked you through all 19 that, Mr. Foote testified, he made the point that, look, the 20 user system stores information in what's called the LDAP. 21 And if we could see from the big deck, 22 Slide No. 11? 23 And this was the high-level architecture of how

their system operates, and the user information -- even

Mr. Foote agreed with Dr. Smith, the user information gets

24

stored up here in the LDAP.

And you recall, there are three different types of user information that he talked about. There were some abbreviations that went with them. There was AGT for agent, CUS for customer, and EMP for employee. Those were the three types of users that use the system.

Now, the data that's important for the work that Great West does, and that's the policy data, the types of wrecks that have occurred, et cetera, all of that data gets stored and used in a completely different place. And that's where who a driver is, how long he's been working, what his motor vehicle record looks like. Even Mr. Foote told you all that gets stored in a completely different place.

That's down here in this IBM DB2 and VSAM tables. That's completely separate and different than the user data that's up in the LDAP.

And, now, they're trying to confuse you. They're trying to pull a fast one on you by saying, well, drivers are users. Well, sometimes drivers are users, but that's a different type of data in this system if somebody is a user. They fall under one of those three things.

And a driver, as far as this system goes, is a piece of important separate content that's necessary for them to underwrite claims.

Now, the Defendants also brought Dr. Crovella in,

and I don't know if you caught it. You had to really be paying attention, but he did give you a non-infringement opinion, and it took about two questions where he just said, no, we don't infringe. He didn't do all the work that Dr. Smith did. He didn't walk you through all the evidence and claim elements to show that this is why. He simply said no and moved on.

And as His Honor said, you are the judges of the credibility of the witnesses in this case. And so it's up to you to decide whether or not to believe Dr. Crovella.

And when you're making that decision, remember, unlike what His Honor said, where the meanings of the claim terms mean the same thing, whether it's infringement or validity, Dr. Crovella said things may mean something depending on whether he's giving his deposition months ago or testifying live in court. He was happy to change what different -- what content was and what his opinions were based on what was going on around him.

So I think you'd agree with me that Dr. Crovella was completely uncredible when it came right down to it.

And because of that, when you get to the first question on the jury charge, I believe we've provided more than a preponderance of the evidence that either one and both of those two systems infringe. And so when you address Question No. 1, your answer should be yes.

And then that will bring us to Question No. 2 which is validity. And here's where the burden shifts to the Defendants because they're asking you to tear this patent up for all time. Because if you find that this patent, the '177 patent is invalid, it's invalid for everything, for all situations, not just this case. And that's why they have a higher burden because the patent has been checked out by the examiners at the Patent Office.

And what do they present you for -- for their validity argument? Well, again, they rely on Dr. Crovella who -- words meaning what he wants them to mean whenever it's convenient.

And then they showed you some diagrams that you can have back in the jury room.

Can we bring up GWX-122?

GWX-122 is their anticipation reference. It's the Pellegrino patent. And if you ask for it, you can have the whole patent, not just the screenshots the Defendants gave you.

And if you look at the whole patent, you'll see that it does not disclose all of the claim elements.

Everything that was on that chart I showed you, everything in Claim 11, and everything in Claim 14 has to be in Pellegrino for it to invalidate the patent. That's what anticipation means.

And, one, Dr. Crovella did not check all those 1 2 boxes. 3 And, two, whenever they showed you any information about Pellegrino, they showed you their own colored-up and 4 modified versions of the -- the images and figures in there. 5 If we could go to the -- Slide 43 of the big deck? 6 7 This is one of the images they showed you. This is not the Pellegrino image. What this is, is their version of 8 the Pellegrino image with things added and things highlighted. And that's because they know Pellegrino by 10 11 itself doesn't get them there. 12 And all of their arguments about validity at the end of the day amount to little more than lawyer fluff, much 13 like Mr. Ponder's marketing fluff. This time we've got 14 15 lawyer fluff. 16 And so for that reason when you get to 17 Question No. 2 on validity and you consider the lawyer fluff 18 that they put up and Dr. Crovella's testimony, we'll submit 19 to you that that doesn't come anywhere close to clear and

that they put up and Dr. Crovella's testimony, we'll submit to you that that doesn't come anywhere close to clear and convincing evidence, to an abiding conviction that it's highly probable.

They failed to meet their burden. They failed to

20

21

22

23

24

25

They failed to meet their burden. They failed to come anywhere close because Pellegrino doesn't get them there even with Dr. Crovella who is willing to say whatever he needs to say.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so when you get to Question No. 2, your answer should be, no, they have not proven that Claim 14 of the '177 patent is invalid. And so when you're done with that, then you need to move to the final question. And that involves the damages to assess in this case. And His Honor told you that in this case, we're talking a reasonable royalty. And you've heard that throughout the case. And also, this -- back to damages is when we get back to the preponderance of the evidence standard where it's our burden to prove more likely than not what the damages are. And so consider the evidence that we've presented to you. One -- if we could bring up Plaintiff's Exhibit 212? This is Mr. Ponder's marketing fluff, as he called it. But even Mr. Ponder's marketing fluff notes that in the second sentence up here in the first paragraph that the newly designed insured portal allows insureds to access information on their own without needing to call their agent. And, of course, the portal is going to give the

agent the ability to access information without needing to

call anybody. We have their own admission that the portal

```
eliminates the need for phone calls.
1
            And we also have -- and you can request this back
 2
   in the jury room -- Plaintiff's Exhibit 213 that discusses
 3
 4
   the portal. This is Mr. Ponder talking to his boss.
            But on the second page -- third page, excuse me,
 5
   you see right there in the middle of the page it notes that
 6
7
   this agent portal is critical to business development, and
   that's why they spend considerable time and attention and IT
 8
   resources on it.
10
            So Mr. Lasinski said: Look, it is valuable. They
   recognized that it's valuable. They recognized that it
11
12
   helps avoid phone calls. So let's look at how it helps
   avoid phone calls.
13
14
            And so Mr. Lasinski walked us through --
15
            Could we bring up Slide 38, please?
            He walked us through a calculation of how he came
16
   up with the number.
17
18
            I'm sorry, maybe the next one, the one with the
19
   full calculation on it.
20
            31, my apologies.
21
            He walked us through Slide 31, and he said, look,
22
   when you look at the exhibits in this case -- for example,
23
   Plaintiff's Exhibit 233 -- over just the period from when
24
   the lawsuit was filed, January 2015 up until August of 2018,
25
   when he had to put together his estimate of damages, his
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
valuation, he looked at the use, and he looked at how many
times people had hit the portal. And he had taken documents
like Exhibit 233, and he had added up all of those portlet
views.
        Now, the Defendants are trying to say -- or the
Defendant is trying to say he overvalued things. Well,
Mr. Lasinski, he didn't take all of those views. He didn't
take the 35.7 million times people went to this portal.
        THE COURT: Counsel, you've used 17 minutes.
        MR. GILLILAND: Thank you, Your Honor.
        He didn't take that number and multiply by the cost
of each phone call. That -- then we'd be in here asking for
something like a hundred million dollars. He didn't.
apportioned it down. He said, look, we've got to take the
landing pages, where they go when they first hit.
        We've got to take out when employees look at it
because we assume employees may be responding to an agent,
and so we don't want to double count. Or employees may be
using it for internal products. But he reduced that all the
way down to just what was an estimate of how many unique
times somebody had looked at those pages.
        And then he calculated, well, how long does an
average phone call and how much per minute does that cost.
```

And because Great West didn't keep the data, he used BITCO

data, their sister company. And he came up with 2.75 per

phone call, and that got him to 30 million.

But then he gave them the benefit of a 12 percent interest rate and knocked that even farther down to the 20.5 million and subtracted out the cost. He did a lot of work to come up with that number. And when he did and when -- and I would submit to you when you get to Question No. 3 and you're considering damages, that a reasonable royalty for use of this invention should be \$20,300,000.00.

And you've got all the work and Mr. Lasinski's credibility to help you understand that. And I would suggest that Defendant's expert's short-circuit rendition of just give them what they paid for -- well, you know -- you know better than that.

They bought this patent in 2008 when it was just an application. It was just a glimmer in the eye of -- at that time when they acquired it, Intellectual Ventures, that it would ever result in a patent. And he wants you to give him that number. You know that's not right, especially when they've used it as much as these Defendants have. So don't let them play you. Don't let them mislead you with lawyer fluff and just make them accept responsibility for their infringement.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Defendant may now present its closing argument.

```
Mr. Bettinger, would you like a warning on your
 1
 2
   time?
 3
            MR. BETTINGER: Your Honor, three minutes, please?
 4
            THE COURT: All right. I'll warn you with three
   minutes remaining.
 5
            You may proceed.
 6
 7
            MR. BETTINGER: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you
   to all the Court personnel through the last couple days.
8
 9
            Ladies and gentlemen, I know I speak for everyone
   on our team in thanking you for your time, your attention,
10
11
   and your patience. The last few days have been busy.
12
   There's been a lot of new terms and a lot of new faces.
                                                             Wе
13
   appreciate that you've taken the time to sit through and
   listen to the evidence in the case.
14
15
            As Judge Gilstrap said at the beginning of the case
   in his opening remarks, our country is unique in the way we
16
17
   resolve disputes. We resolve them to a jury, a jury of our
18
           We resolve them with our fellow citizens, and you
   are our fellow citizens.
19
20
            This is our opportunity to review the evidence that
21
   has been presented over the last three to four days and put
22
   it in order and make sense of it.
23
            I emphasize evidence because Judge Gilstrap has
24
   told us it is your job to make a decision in this case based
25
   on the evidence.
```

Ladies and gentlemen, attorney argument is not evidence. Attorney questions that are worded in a way to suggest that a witness is somehow changing the truth, accusations that you're switching horses in the case, accusations, lawyers are engaging in fluff, accusations that a defense wasn't disclosed and it's being disclosed for the first time, that is not evidence. None of that is. It is simply attorney bluster.

From the outset of this case, our goal has been to provide you with evidence, evidence that you need to make a decision in the case. We brought the witnesses. We put them on the stand so that you could look them in the eye, size them up, and figure out what is really going on here. In other words, we showed up. We put Mr. Foote and Mr. Ponder on the stand.

You also had an opportunity to see Mr. Arends on video. Seeing these witnesses, getting a real feel for who Great West is, what it does, that's evidence. Learning that all three of the witnesses, Foote, Ponder, and Arends, each have worked for Great West for around 25 years -- 25, 24, and 27 years, respectively. That says something about a company. That says something about the witnesses when you're there that long.

We showed up. We are the ones who explained the patent. We are the ones who gave you some idea what

```
Claim 14 was. The elements it requires, a centralized access point that allows one to manage content that is contributed by them.
```

By doing so, we signalled to IV, go ahead, question our witnesses, ask the questions you want. We'll answer your questions straight up. That's what presenting evidence at trial is all about.

We explained our website. We explained it has three portals, one for the truckers, one for agents, and one for employees. We showed you the document. Showed you our copy. There -- showed you more documents. We have nothing to hide. We put it all on the table, and that's the thing. When you show up, there is nothing to hide. It's there for everyone to see, for you to see, to take a look to make a decision in this case.

Well, that's not what happened with IV. They were nowhere to be found. They came into this court asking for \$20.3 million and did not have the common decency to show up, to take the witness stand, and answer questions.

The way I was raised, you want that kind of money, show up, tell me how, tell me why. Let me -- let me take a look in your eyes. Let me see how you testified. Let me see. Let me get a real feel for who you are. That's what you do when you come in and ask for that kind of money. You come into court, and you explain it. Why would you win?

```
Why IV, why you should win? Get on the stand and explain
1
 2
   it.
            Let this -- let the ladies and the gentleman of the
 3
   jury, let you take a look at the witness, figure out where
 4
   they're coming in, look them in the eye, see what type of
 5
   person they really are. That's how you present evidence.
 6
 7
            What is not evidence and in my view just not right
 8
   is to send in lawyers and paid experts while you sit in some
   high rise office building in Seattle waiting for a big score
   on a patent that you bought for a couple hundred thousand
10
11
   dollars.
12
            Folks, that's not the way it works. Have the
13
   courtesy, the decency to show up and make your case. And
   when the lawyers go into court, don't have them try and
14
15
   belittle witnesses who do show up.
16
            Remember when IV's counsel was questioning
   Mr. Foote -- if we could put Slide 2 up -- the guy who had
17
```

Remember when IV's counsel was questioning

Mr. Foote -- if we could put Slide 2 up -- the guy who had
been here from the start of trial, and he suggested that

Mr. Foote was somehow shading his testimony. You've been
doing your very best so far not to harm through your
testimony at Great West.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Foote gave him really real answers. He's a real guy who said: No, I've been trying to answer accurately and honestly.

Come on, you're going to go after Mr. Foote. The

guy doesn't have a mean bone in his body. He's been sitting in court this entire time. He answered every question put to him.

But it got worse. Remember, counsel suggested Mr. Foote was somehow changing the inflection in his voice when he answered no. Really? That's all you've got is to try to smear Mr. Foote? That's not evidence, and that's just not right.

Here's the deal. The idea of buying a patent and then hiring lawyers and experts to go out and try to make money on it. Well, that might work on Wall Street. But not here where decisions are based on evidence.

So what I want to do this morning is review the evidence that was presented to allow you to make a decision in this case because your decision is based on evidence.

And I want to focus on two issues, the infringement and the invalidity evidence because as you heard yesterday, you don't reach the issue of damages if this patent is not infringed and if this patent is invalid.

So let's turn first to infringement and look at that evidence.

And just to orient ourselves, remember, Claim 14 requires you have a centralized access point, and the two have been identified in here. There's been -- the parties agree, it's the agent portal and it's the Drivers List By

```
Policy page on the agent portal, okay, right? That's the
1
 2
   first thing they say we -- that infringes.
            The second thing they say is the employee portal,
 3
   and it's the homepage. Nothing else. Those two pages.
 4
   That's all that's at issue in this case. Do those two pages
 5
   infringe Claim 14? Those are our centralized access points.
 6
 7
            If we could go to the next slide?
 8
            And then that centralized access point, you have to
   be able to manage and contribute content. You have to
9
   manage and contribute content.
10
11
            So the centralized access point, those two pages,
12
   you have to show that you manage content -- you contribute
13
   it and that you manage it.
            Well, who took you through -- what's content? Did
14
15
   you ever hear one word from them on -- as to what content
   is? We took you through, hey, look, there's this -- the way
16
   the patent talks about is content is, it's these articles.
17
18
   It tells you something. That's what content is.
19
            And we showed you Exhibit 45 from the patent. The
20
   patent is PX-001. And then -- and showed you, hey, this
21
   paragraph here, that's content. And then we asked the same
22
   question of their expert, Dr. Smith.
23
            We said: Dr. Smith, at Figure 45, are you familiar
24
   with that screen called clearing clogged drains?
25
            He says: Yes, I've seen it before.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
And then shows the content contribution which is
clearing clogged drains. That's content, correct?
        He says: Yes, that's correct.
        So you agree that Screen 45 is showing us content?
        Yeah, it shows us content.
        We're the one who explained that. That's what
content is. It's those articles. It's something that
says -- it's a description. That's how the patent uses the
term "content."
        If we could go to the next slide?
        And then what we also know is what content is not,
and this is the uncontested facts. And as the jury
instructions Your Honor has read, is that's like it was
proven in court here. What content does not include, it
can't be those articles. It does not include information
about users. That's a fact and proven here in this court.
That's what the instructions say. Content does not include
information about users.
        So if we could go to the next slide?
        Both experts agreed.
        We asked -- asked Smith: You agree scope of
content does not include information about users?
        Dr. Smith: Yes.
        Professor Crovella: My opinion, and it's
consistent throughout all my reports, is that information
```

```
1
   about users is not content.
 2
            The next one.
            And then, you know, further on, we had this whole
 3
   point about is a driver a user -- driver is a user, and why
 4
   that's a problem. And it kills their case is the drivers
 5
   are users. Information about users isn't content, right?
 6
 7
   So they had to try to fight hard on that. Oh, we can't --
   we can't have the drivers be users because once that
 8
   happens, all that information is information about the
10
   use -- the driver who's a user, then it's not content.
            But -- but on the -- their first witness they put
11
12
   up, Dr. Smith, we asked him point blank: So the driver is a
   user of the Great website -- Great West website, correct?
13
14
            And his answer is: Yes, correct.
15
            Right there he's telling us, he knows drivers are
   users of the website, for goodness sake. Earlier -- you
16
   heard today they're not even going to fight it anymore.
17
18
   They -- they gave up.
19
            And so -- all right. And as a user of that
20
   website, they have a user name password and a user name,
21
   correct?
22
            Correct.
23
            So, now, they're a user?
24
            And he says: Correct.
25
            So the drivers are users of the website.
```

```
If we could go to the next slide?
 1
 2
            We asked the same question of Mr. Foote. He would
   know best. He designed the website. We brought him in
 3
   here, and we asked: Hey, so once the driver is logged in,
   can they use the website?
 5
            He goes: Yes.
 6
 7
            Is there any reason they couldn't do that?
 8
            And he says: No. They can do that.
 9
            And, again, we asked: Once the trucker is granted
   credentials, could they become a user of the website?
10
11
            Yes.
12
            So that's out. We know users include the drivers.
   Drivers are users of the website.
13
14
            If we could go to the next slide there?
15
            So why does that matter? Because here's the first
   page that they say is the centralized access point, Drivers
16
   List By Policy. It's GWX-494. GWX-494 is the Driver List
17
18
   By Policy.
19
            And you recall the testimony from Mr. Foote, if you
20
   click on that driver name -- in this one Anthony Made over
21
   on the left -- it takes you to the screen called Driver
22
   Detail, which is GWX-493 -- GWX-493.
23
            And so what I want to do is walk you through --
24
   okay, you click on that driver. That information is there
   on the Driver List By Policy. What can an agent do? What
25
```

```
can they do to that page because that's where they're
1
   claiming the content is that has to be modified?
 2
            So let's -- if you click on that name from -- you
 3
   go to GWX-493, and in the agent manual, which is Exhibit 482
 4
   at Page 49, those -- the different categories in the driver
 5
   detail are listed in what they call collapsed form.
 6
 7
   show you the different areas where you can go in and what
   you can do with the -- with the information in the Driver By
 8
   Policy List.
10
            And there's only three buttons, and you heard this
   testimony from Mr. Foote. There's only three buttons that
11
12
   you can click on to do anything there. There's an edit
   button for the driver personal information. There's an add
13
   license for the licenses. And there's an add account for
14
15
   the Great West employment information.
16
            So if they have any case at all, if you're going to
   have to modify content, you got to -- it's got to be through
17
18
   one of these three buttons. You have to be able to click on
19
   one of those three buttons to go in and modify the content
20
   because you can't get to anything else.
21
            So let's take a look at what each of the three
22
   buttons are.
23
            And if we could, please, go to the next slide.
24
            So when you click on that Driver Personal
```

Information, you click on that button Edit, it takes you --

```
and you can see this in the -- in the agent manual, 482 at
1
 2
   Page 51 -- it takes you to the Update Driver Personal
   Information where you can go in and update first name,
 3
   middle name, last name, suffix, gender, date of birth, years
   of experience. That's all you can update.
 5
            Well, folks, that's information about a user.
 6
7
   know that the truckers are users, and that's information
   about a user. So it can't be content. That's been our
 8
   position from the outset. It can't be content under their
   own patent because it's information about a user.
10
11
            If we could hit the next slide?
12
            And even Dr. Smith admitted: If all you're doing
13
   is managing information about a user, you are not managing
   content, correct?
14
15
            And he said: Yep, I'd agree with you on that.
            So if all you're doing is managing information
16
   about a user, the driver's name, a driver's date of birth,
17
18
   you're not managing content. If you're not managing
   content, you're not infringing Claim 14.
19
            Mr. -- Dr. Smith went further.
20
21
            The next slide, please.
22
            If all you're managing is information about users,
23
   you're not managing content, correct?
24
            Correct.
25
            And if you're not managing content, you can't
```

```
infringe, correct?
1
 2
            That would be correct.
            There was more evidence.
 3
            If we could go to slide -- the next slide.
 4
            So then he said, well, okay -- well, then,
 5
   information about users, it's not content. So then what did
 6
7
   Dr. Smith do? He had to take a position that makes
 8
   absolutely no sense in this case.
            And I asked him straight out: So just to be clear,
   it's your position that all those entries, first name,
10
11
   middle name, last name, suffix, gender, all that, for a
12
   driver who has password and user name is a user of the Great
13
   West system, that information about that user is not
   information about that user?
14
15
            I asked him: Is that your position?
            And he said: Yes, that's not information about the
16
17
   user.
18
            Come on. That's exactly what it is. It's the --
   the title of the -- of the thing says information about
19
20
   drivers. It's exactly what it is, but it forces them into
21
   this position. It makes no sense at all where you're having
22
   to say personal information about a user is not user
23
   information.
24
            So I -- the position has never made any sense, and
   Dr. Smith had to give it up in the -- in his testimony.
25
```

```
If we could hit the next slide, please?
 1
 2
            The second button you can hit is Add License to
   Driver. That's the second area. But there, you can't
 3
   modify any existing content. All you can do is add a
   driver's license. And it was undisputed in this case, just
 5
   adding information is not managing it. Just adding
 6
7
   information does not mean you're managing. You'd have to
   take information that exists and go in and do something to
 8
   it to manage it.
10
            If we show on the -- and this is, by the way,
11
   GWX-490. If you want to see that Add License to Driver,
   it's GWX-490.
12
13
            If we go to the next slide.
            We asked both experts: You can't delete the old
14
15
   license. You can only add a new one, right?
16
            That's correct.
            So you can't edit any -- or delete any of this
17
   driver's license information?
18
19
            No.
20
            So you're not managing anything by adding a
21
   driver's license?
22
            And Dr. Smith said the same thing -- if you go to
23
   the next slide -- we asked: So adding a user is not
24
   managing; it's contributing; is that right?
25
           Yes. Adding the user is not managing, it's
```

```
1
   contributing.
 2
            So adding a license is not managing.
            Okay. That leaves one more button that you can
 3
 4
   click to do anything to try to establish that you're
   managing content.
 5
            If we could go to the next slide?
 6
 7
            And that's the Update Employment Information. You
   can -- you can click on that button. That was the testimony
 8
   of Mr. Foote. And at GWX-482 at Page 57, we look, and
   that's the only information you can update is the customer,
10
11
   the status, and the hire date. It's information about a
12
   user. That's all you can do.
            And this is so far removed from what content is in
13
   the patent, which is an article. But even if you go down
14
15
   this road, this is the only thing that you can change is
16
   this information. That's not content, so under Claim 14,
   you're not managing content. And that's what our position
17
18
   has been all along.
19
            So those are the three buttons where you can do
20
   anything.
21
            If you look at the other four -- on the next slide,
22
   please.
23
            Oh, and Dr. Smith agreed: You're aware, sir, that
24
   when a driver is deleted from -- so if you delete a driver
25
   from the Drivers By Policy List, they're not removed from
```

```
the website?
1
 2
            He agreed: They're not removed.
            So you're not getting rid of a driver. You're just
 3
 4
   removing them from attached to that policy, and Mr. Foote
   said the same thing.
 5
 6
            You see down at the box, there's a sentence: After
7
   the customer relationship has ended, the driver is still on
   the Great West master list.
 8
            Do you see that?
10
            Yes.
11
            What does that mean?
12
            Well, we can't lose that information, so we do not
   delete the driver.
13
14
            And then he went on to explain why.
15
            You can't argue, oh, you're managing because you're
   deleting a driver. Because you're not. You're not deleting
16
17
   a driver. It remains in the system. You're detaching them
18
   from a policy.
19
            So if we could then go to slide -- the next slide?
20
            The other four: Great West Driver Status
21
   Information, General License Information, MVR Violations,
22
   and Great West Claims and Reported Incidents.
23
            The testimony was consistent from both witnesses
24
   that you can't do anything there. You can't -- you can't
25
   edit. You can't delete. You can't touch any of that
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
document. And as an example, if we go -- for example, just
the status information, Dr. Smith: So for this information,
the agent can't do anything to change that?
        And he says: No, not -- not from this screen.
        And Mr. Foote agreed. He said: Can the agent
delete any of this information?
        No.
        From any other screen?
        No.
        And the testimony was consistent for all four of
those, the MVR screen and -- and the others.
        So where does that leave us in -- and if you could,
Mr. Simmons, go to Slide 33?
        I'm sorry, go back, please, to 20 -- yeah.
        That then leaves us with looking at the Report
Rates on -- which is Slide 28. And when we go to the Report
Rates, which is the other one, the testimony was consistent
across the board. You're only creating new reports. You
can't do anything with the old reports. They have to stay
in the system. It's required by state regulations. You
can't get rid of any of this information. So you go to
change anything here, you keep the old report, you have to
create a new report.
        If we could go to Slide 29, please?
        Dr. Smith agreed with us. So each time that a new
```

```
1
   policy is created, the old policy is kept, correct?
 2
            Yep, that's my understanding.
 3
            So you would be adding a new policy -- the
   correction would be adding a new policy?
 4
            Okay. I agree.
 5
            It's a new policy. It's not managing an old
 6
7
   policy. You're not changing it. You're creating a new one.
 8
   So you're not managing content by doing that.
            If we look at Slide 30?
            Mr. Foote explained the same thing. All these
10
   reports are new reports. How about once a report is
11
12
   entered, can it ever be changed?
13
            No.
14
            Can an employee edit or delete?
15
            No.
            So with the Report Rates, it's the same thing.
16
17
   With Claim 14, you can't manage any content. You can't
18
   manage what's there. You can only create new or add, and
   everyone agrees that adding is not managing. That goes to
19
20
   the contributing part.
21
            So if we go to the next slide, please?
22
            Where we're at is when you get to the guestion of
23
   infringement, and this is what your question will look like
24
   on your jury questionnaire: Did IV prove by a preponderance
25
   that Great West has infringed?
```

The answer is, no.

They didn't show that you could manage any of the content on that Driver List By Policy page because information about users is not content. And if you can't edit, delete, or do anything to the content, you're not managing it. That was the evidence on infringement. That's what we have been saying all along, and we, as shown here, presented you with evidence on that point.

Turn briefly to the invalidity.

If we go to the next slide.

In this case, there is a -- the parties have agreed that Claim 11 -- remember, invalidity, Claim 11, and then you have Claim 14? Claim 11, the independent claim, the parties have agreed, and IV admits, that Claim 11 is invalid.

If you look at the next slide, what we also know is that IV did not contest anything about our analysis of Claim 11. All those steps that Dr. Crovella went through to show every element of Claim 11 was met, IV did not contest any one of those.

So the only issue we're left with -- if they're not contesting, then, look, that Pellegrino teacher reference, that has all the elements of Claim 11. So the only thing we're looking at now is, all right, what about Claim -- Claim 14, does it have the elements of Claim 14? That's all

```
we're left with.
1
 2
            And if you go and look -- we -- we would need to
   show that you're managing content. So we have the apparatus
 3
   of Claim 11.
 4
            Can you go back for a minute, Mr. Simmons?
 5
            We have the apparatus of Claim 11. All you have to
 6
7
   now show is can you manage the content, and can you
   contribute the content? And the evidence on this was
 8
   undisputed.
10
            Why? IV never brought any witness to talk about
11
   invalidity. They brought no one into this court to defend
12
   their patent. Smith didn't talk about it. They didn't
13
   bring anybody.
            So we're looking at only the evidence that Crovella
14
15
   presented. They're not disputing it.
16
            And if we go to the next slide, here it is.
17
            So it was pointed to -- it's Figure 5 of the
18
   Pellegrino patent, which is GWX-122. And if you look at
   that slide, Lesson Element 160 includes both text and audio
19
20
   material, so you're contributing content.
21
            And here what I would say is, well, here, you're
22
   really talking about content. This is how the patent talks
23
   about content. It's an article about clearing clogged
24
   drains. Well, here's an article about the -- the space
```

program -- the United States space program. That's content.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Those are words. That's saying something. And that's
exactly what Pellegrino does. And the teacher can
contribute that content.
        If we go to the next slide.
        The teacher can then manage the content. Manage
that lesson that they're going to do on the astronauts, they
can go in there and they want to change something, so at --
the Pellegrino patent, which is, again, GWX-122, if you want
to take a look at it, at Lines -- Column 24, Lines 62
through 64, the teacher can go in and modify the lesson.
        Okay. Now, you actually are managing content then.
You're changing the words on the screen. That's all that's
left with Pellegrino is those two elements, and they don't
bring anybody to say we're wrong, and they can't. That's
exactly what the reference shows.
        So as you heard -- if we could get the next slide?
        As you heard -- and by the way, Dr. Crovella was
clear that there is content -- there is content in the
Pellegrino reference.
        If we hit the next slide, what you know and have
been told is, okay, we've got to show this by clear and
convincing evidence, clear and convincing evidence that that
Claim 14 is invalid.
        Well, we know Claim 14 has all the elements of
Claim 11 because of that independent/dependent. They don't
```

```
dispute that. IV doesn't dispute Claim 11.
1
 2
            And then we know on Claim 14, the two elements,
   managing -- contributing content and managing it, they're
 3
   both there. They're both disclosed in the patent.
 4
            Okay. Well, if we go to the next slide.
 5
            And by the way, Dr. Crovella had no -- he was asked
 6
7
   by counsel for IV: And you maintain that it is clear and
 8
   convincing that Claim 14 is invalid, don't you?
            And he had no reservations, but absolutely it is.
   Absolutely, given this record. And then nobody from IV got
10
11
   up to dispute it. They didn't call anybody on that point.
12
   They presented no evidence.
            So what's the impact of that? It's not only clear
13
   and convincing evidence. It's the only evidence. That's
14
   all that's on this record is that that -- that that
15
   Pellegrino patent invalidates Claim 14.
16
17
            THE COURT: You have three minutes remaining.
18
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
            MR. BETTINGER:
19
            So what do you hear from counsel? Oh, you take
20
   away our patent, you take away everything. No, we don't.
21
   They only sued us on Claim 14. It's only Claim 14 that
22
   we're asking be taken away because it's invalid. That's
23
   what they chose to sue us on. It's Claim 14.
24
            And remember their expert when they went and bought
   the patent, those three patents, they bought three patents,
25
```

```
didn't they? So we take away one claim of one patent, and
   they come in here and say, oh, you're taking away everything
   we have. No, we're not. We're taking away one claim. Why?
 3
   Because Pellegrino invalidates it. And they didn't put up
   any evidence to suggest otherwise.
 5
            So where does that leave us? When you get to the
 6
7
   verdict form -- if you could, Mr. Simmons -- we have a
 8
   question: Did Great West prove by clear and convincing
   evidence that Claim 14 is invalid?
10
            Yes.
11
            I don't know how there could be any other answer.
12
   We put the only evidence on in the case. None of it has
   been disputed.
13
14
            So let me turn just for a moment to damages.
15
   And -- and recall, we don't say you get to this because the
16
   patent isn't infringed, and the patent is invalid. If Claim
17
   14 is not infringed, then Claim 14 is not valid. It's
18
   invalid. So, therefore, you don't get to damages. You just
   don't get to it.
19
            But I want to hit on it for one -- one reason.
20
21
            If you could put up the next slide?
22
            Remember, yesterday Mr. Bakewell testified.
23
   kind of had a chart like this and said, well, I didn't --
24
   I couldn't put those to scale because if I did, that red
25
   line would go off the chart. Well, what we went back and
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
I asked our -- our team to do is, hey, put it to scale.
What's it look like when you're asking for $20.3 million
over on the right? And what's it look -- what do the rest
of these look like? And that's to scale. That's to scale.
        So as you can see, drawing to scale, that's what
the patent had been valued before this lawsuit, all the way
through. We were sued in January of 2015. Purchase, sales,
all those things are going on. That's the value of the
patent in 2015. And they come in here four years later and
say they want to $20.3 million.
        Look, once the Wall Street boys got ahold of this
patent, hired some lawyers, and paid some experts, they
hatched a plan. They tried to make it look like the patent
was worth $20.3 million when they knew that wasn't the case.
        I can just see them all in their conference room.
Hey, we've got a really good one here. We're going to turn
that thing into $20.3 million. This patent talking about
content being managed -- contributed and managed on a
website.
        Maybe we can confuse some folks. Maybe we can pull
a fast one. Maybe we can go after witnesses and attorneys
rather than present evidence. Maybe we can just avoid the
evidence. Maybe we can get a company like
Great West. Hey, maybe they'll pay a whole bunch of money
in settlement.
```

```
THE COURT: Counsel, your time has expired. Take a
1
 2
   few -- few seconds and finish up.
 3
            MR. BETTINGER: Yeah.
            So -- but you know what they overlooked, this is
 4
   about the evidence -- the evidence that you heard in this
 5
   case, the documents we just showed you.
 6
 7
            So, ladies and gentlemen, you're the check in the
   system. You get to require a Plaintiff to show up, look
 8
   them in the eye, size them up. And when they -- when they
   decide to hide, you get to consider that, too, and you get
10
11
   to do the right thing. Fair is fair.
12
            Thank you. And we appreciate your time.
            THE COURT: All right. Plaintiff may present its
13
   final closing argument.
14
            Mr. Gilliland, you have 10 minutes and 33 seconds
15
16
   left.
17
            Would you like a warning?
18
            MR. GILLILAND: If I could have a warning at two
   minutes, Your Honor?
19
20
            THE COURT: All right. I'll do that. And you may
21
   proceed.
22
            MR. GILLILAND:
                            Thank you.
23
            Ladies and gentlemen, that was a very interesting
24
   argument, I'll say, by Mr. Bettinger. But I'll submit to
25
   you that that's just marketing fluff -- I mean, lawyer fluff
```

```
from the same company that brought you marketing fluff.
1
 2
   we're going to walk through just a few of the things.
            They say they've got nothing to hide, that they're
 3
   being candid and honest with you. They put up -- you
 4
   noticed every one of those slides he put up. I think every
 5
   single one of them had the -- the three little periods,
 6
7
   ellipses or whatever, you know, and that means we're not
   showing you the whole truth. We're not showing you
 8
   everything.
10
            Everything single thing they've shown you, they've
11
   cut something out of it, removed something off of it, or
12
   tried to hide it from you.
            As a matter of fact, if we could bring up -- let's
13
14
   bring up GWX-761.
15
            And these are some of the stipulations that they've
16
   talked about over and over. And if we could go to the next
17
   page, I want to point out to you -- one of the things, you
18
   heard them complain and contest infringement.
19
            And we brought you evidence on infringement because
20
   that was our burden to prove infringement. Well, they've
21
   contested and raised all these issues about it, and they've
22
   shown you pieces of the stipulations.
```

But if we could go down to No. 14.

Defendants admit -- that they'll at least admit the

Not once -- not one single time did these

23

24

25

administrative interface is there.

They didn't even -- even with their own expert and even when Mr. Bettinger is telling you they've got nothing to hide, they never pointed out that, we'll at least admit that much, that when you look at Claim 11 in the back of the patent and you see an administrative interface, we'll admit that we have an administrative interface. Not once did they tell you that.

Instead, they keep picking from other parts of this and just showing you pieces, bits and pieces of what's going on.

And what we've tried to do is bring you the truth, bring you the evidence to demonstrate to you that they do, in fact, infringe. They do, in fact, use Intellectual Ventures's patent, Intellectual Ventures's property.

You can take that down, Mr. Cartwright. And if you will -- let's see, can you bring up the testimony from yesterday afternoon?

They complain that we did not bring up -- or bring evidence of validity. Well, you know as well as I do because His Honor told you that that is their burden, and it's their burden to prove that the patent is invalid by clear and convincing evidence, to create in your minds enough evidence to create a clear and abiding conviction that it is highly probable than not. That's their burden.

If they don't get there, if they don't cross that clear and convincing finish line, it is not my job or Intellectual Ventures's job to go out and pick them up and drag them the rest of the way.

And they didn't get there, and you know they didn't get there because if we could go to Page 133, this is just one example. I'm sure you remember several others because you heard the testimony. You don't have to rely on some lawyer fabricated slide created last night to understand the testimony.

If we look at Page 133. This is their expert,

Dr. Crovella, on the witness stand. And my colleague,

Mr. Rupp, asked him: Said that at that time, November 30th,

2018, your answer of whether or not a user adding their

address or submitting a change of address into the Great

West portal system was or was not contributing content, and

your answer at that time under oath was: Yes, that is user

contributing content.

His answer: At that time, in that context, yes.

So about six months ago, he agreed with us that a user adding their address and submitting a change of address was content.

But today, questioned by Mr. Rupp -- and this is just yesterday afternoon: Today you have a different opinion -- or two days ago in the afternoon, I'm sorry,

What do you think changed between November of last year and his testimony in this courtroom today that caused him to change his mind? He had no explanation for that.

Well, I think we all know what happened with that. I think there was a little seed planted in his mind whether by an insurance company or whether by a lawyer, but they encouraged him to change his mind.

Now, they've given Intellectual Ventures a hard time for not having anybody here. I'm sorry, I should have been more clear in opening and voir dire, but Mr. Win, who has sat here with us every day, is from Intellectual Ventures. And he is not from Wall Street, all right? He's not any guy in a big double breasted suit in a tall building up in New York. He's been here every day.

But there's nothing Mr. Win needed to tell you to help understand their system. They're the people that have the information you need to answer the questions on this verdict form, not Intellectual Ventures.

And they -- they talk about the price of the patent. And Mr. Bettinger had him create a slide, supposedly last night, putting into scale because

```
Mr. Bakewell was unable to do that. Well, let's put that
1
 2
   into context a little bit.
            They say that this number should just be -- they
 3
   might have pumped a lot of oil off of our property. They
 4
   might have taken a lot of water from our reservoir. But
 5
   they should only have to pay for $300,000.00. That's all he
 6
7
   says you should get, just what Intellectual Ventures paid
8
   for this patent when it wasn't even a patent yet. It was
   just a glimmer in the eye of an inventor.
            Well, let's put that into context, and if we can
10
11
   pull up GWX-389?
12
            This is one of the rating policy documents that
   we've talked about.
13
            Let's go to -- I think it's the third page and zoom
14
15
   in, if you will, to the center of the page there.
16
            This is one of those where they can go in, and they
   can enter the mileage, and it helps calculate how much the
17
18
   premium that company owns. And this is a company that
   just -- it's got 65 power units. It's one truck -- one
19
20
   trucking company, excuse me. One trucking company. And
21
   their rating policy data shows that for one year -- just one
22
   year, that company is going to pay Great West $217,000.00.
23
   It's kind of blurry, but you can see it. $217,000.00, the
24
   price of a one-year trucking policy for one customer is what
25
   Mr. Bakewell says they owe for hitting our invention, for
```

2

10

24

25

```
hitting that portal over 35 million times in just a short
   three-year period, from January 2015 to August 2018.
            Now, if we were to count all the other times
 3
   they've used it and are still using it today, you know that
 4
   number would sky rocket. But we're -- we and Mr. Lasinski
 5
   have tried to be reasonable with the use.
 6
 7
            And then, finally, let's just talk just briefly
   about the dam -- I mean, about the testimony. Again,
 8
   they've given you a hard time about -- or given us a hard
   time -- oh, let me back up.
11
            Actually, can we bring up GX-122, please? I'm
12
   shifting gears back to this validity question.
            And they've talked about and they've said that
13
   Dr. Crovella, who plays the ground is flat depending on
14
15
   which day of the week it is or where he happens to be.
   Well, they've shown you -- this is the Pellegrino patent,
16
17
   and they've shown you bits and pieces with a lot of artistic
18
   rendering to it.
19
            But if we could go to Page 17 of the Pellegrino
20
   patent.
21
            Here's something they didn't show you. This is the
22
   figures out of the Pellegrino patent. And the top figure is
   a lesson that a teacher is building. They're adding
23
```

content. But they haven't contributed yet. They haven't

published it. And if we scroll down just a little bit to

the figure below, I'm not going to modify this. This is straight out of the patent. And if you look right here above where it says Copy Lesson No. 374, it says: Lesson had been published and cannot be modified.

Pellegrino, in the figures that they didn't bother showing you, demonstrate Pellegrino does not teach managing content. They didn't come anywhere close to the clear and convincing finish line that they needed to cross.

THE COURT: Two minutes remaining.

MR. GILLILAND: Thank you, Your Honor.

So we did not have to put on a witness to try and drag them across their own finish line.

And, finally, talking about people you will not hear from. Well, Mr. Foote took the stand, and some of the information Mr. Foote gave you came from Mr. Posson sitting out here in the gallery. And he's the general counsel for Great West. He's their in-house lawyer. He never took the witness stand. He could have gotten up here and told you that information himself, but he didn't.

But what he will do is he will wait patiently for you to come out that door with your verdict. And when you do, he's going to walk right out of this courtroom, and he's going to get on his phone and he's going to make a phone call. And that phone call is either going to say, hey, we played that East Texas jury. We got away with it. Or it's

going to say: Guys, the gig is up. Even insurance companies have to follow the rules. Even insurance companies have to accept responsibility and pay for things they use. And which way that phone call goes, ladies and gentlemen, is up to you.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to provide you with a few final instructions before you begin your deliberations.

You must perform your duty as jurors without bias or prejudice as to any party. The law does not permit you to be controlled by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion.

All parties in this case expect that you will carefully and impartially consider all the evidence, follow the law as I have given it to you, and reach a just verdict, regardless of the consequences.

Answer each question in the verdict form from the facts as you find them from this case, following the instructions that the Court has given you.

Do not decide who you think should win and then answer the questions accordingly. Again, your answers and your verdict must be unanimous.

You should consider and decide this case as a dispute between persons of equal standing in the community, of equal worth and holding the same or similar stations in

1 life. This is true in patent cases between corporations,
2 partnerships, and individuals.

A patent owner is entitled to protect its rights under the laws of the United States. This includes bringing a suit in a U.S. District Court for money damages for infringement.

The law recognizes no distinction among types of parties. All corporations, partnerships, and other organizations stand equal before the law, regardless of their size, regardless of who owns them, and they are to be treated as equals.

Now, when you retire to the jury room to deliberate on your verdict, as I've said, you'll each have a copy of these final instructions from the Court to you to take with you.

If you desire during your deliberations to review any of the exhibits which the Court has admitted into evidence, then you should advise me by a written note given to the Court Security Officer and signed by your foreperson.

And I will then send that exhibit or those exhibits to you.

Once you retire, you should first select your foreperson and then conduct your deliberations. If you recess during your deliberations, follow all the instructions the Court has given you about your conduct during the trial.

After you've reached your verdict, your foreperson is to fill in the answers in the verdict form which reflect your unanimous decisions. Do not reveal your answers until such time as you're discharged unless otherwise directed by me. And you must never disclose to anyone, not even to me, your numerical division on any question.

Any notes that you've taken over the course of the trial are aids to your memory only. If your memory should differ from your notes, then rely on your memory and not your notes. The notes are not evidence. And a juror who has not taken notes should rely on his or her own independent recollection of the evidence and should not be unduly influenced by the notes of other jurors.

Notes are not entitled to any other -- any greater weight than the recollection or impression of each juror about the testimony.

If you want to communicate with me at any time during your deliberations, you should give a message or a question to the Court Security Officer, which has been signed by your foreperson. The Court Security Officer will then bring it me.

I'll respond as promptly as possible, either in writing or by having you brought back into the courtroom where I can address you orally.

I will always first disclose to the attorneys in

```
the case your question and my response before I answer any
1
 2
   question.
            After you have reached a verdict and I've
 3
 4
   discharged you from your job as jurors, I want you to
   understand you are not required to talk with anyone about
 5
   your service in the case.
 6
 7
            But by the same token, at that time, you will be
   free to discuss your service in this case with anyone of
 8
   your choosing. The choice is yours at that point in time,
   ladies and gentlemen, and yours alone.
10
11
            I'll now hand eight copies of the verdict -- excuse
   me, the instructions from the Court to the jury and the
12
   verdict form to the Court Security Officer to deliver to the
13
   jury in the verdict -- to deliver to the jury during
14
   deliberations.
15
16
            Ladies of -- ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you
   may now retire to the jury room to deliberate. We await
17
18
   your verdict.
19
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise for the jury.
20
            (Jury out.)
21
            THE COURT: Be seated, please.
22
            Counsel, you are more than welcome to wait here in
23
   the courtroom if you desire. By the same token, if you are
24
   not in the courtroom, please make sure that my staff has an
   active, working cell phone number where we can reach you in
25
```

```
1
   the event the Court receives either a note from the jury or
 2
   a verdict.
 3
            Pending a question from the jury or a return of
   their verdict, the Court stands in recess.
 4
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
 5
            (Recess.)
 6
 7
            (Jury out.)
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
 8
 9
            THE COURT: Be seated, please.
            All right. Counsel, we've received a note from the
10
11
   jury. It's signed by Ms. Edwards, who I assume to be Juror
12
   No. 1, as the juror foreperson.
13
            I'm going to mark the note in the upper right-hand
   corner as No. 1 for identification. I'll hand the original
14
15
   note to the Courtroom Deputy.
            I have two copies of the note for each side. If
16
   you'll approach the bench.
17
18
            MR. BETTINGER: Okay. Thank you.
19
            THE COURT: Let me go over it with you, and then
20
   we'll talk about an appropriate response.
21
            The jury requests six specific exhibits. They've
22
   given them by exact exhibit number, and I've already pulled
23
   them and placed them in the same order that they requested
24
   them in the note. Beyond those six exhibits, the note says:
25
   And Uncontested Facts Listing.
```

```
1
            I assume that's the stipulated facts.
 2
            MR. BETTINGER: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
            THE COURT: And we ought to be able to hand them
   that document.
 4
            Then it says: And Dr. Crovella's testimony
 5
   transcript.
 6
 7
            Obviously, I can't give them the transcript of his
   testimony. And I'll tell them that in the note.
 8
            With regard to the Uncontested Facts Listing, is
   that an exhibit? Is it a document filed on the document?
10
11
   What's the best way for us to agree on what that is and
12
   produce it so that I can send it back to them?
13
            MR. BETTINGER: It's Exhibit 761.
14
            MR. GILLILAND: It is, Your Honor.
15
            MR. BETTINGER: GWX-761.
            THE COURT: Plaintiff's?
16
17
            MR. GILLILAND: Defendant's Exhibit.
18
            MR. BETTINGER: GWX is the --
19
            THE COURT: GWX?
20
            MR. BETTINGER: Yes.
21
            THE COURT: What's the number again?
22
            MR. BETTINGER: 761.
23
            THE COURT: 761.
24
            MR. BETTINGER: Yes.
25
            THE COURT: All right. Ms. Lockhart, if you'll
```

```
1
   pull that one.
 2
            Notice of Uncontested Facts. Good. I'll put that
   in the list.
 3
            All right. Counsel, I'll tell you what, I'm going
 4
   to recess briefly. And I'll prepare a written response to
 5
   go back to the jury with these exhibits, and I'll be back as
 6
7
   soon as that's ready and go over it with you and get your
 8
   approval before I send it to the jury.
            So don't leave the courtroom, but the Court stands
10
   in recess.
11
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
12
            (Recess.)
13
            (Jury out.)
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
14
15
            THE COURT: Be seated, please.
            All right. Counsel, I've got a written response to
16
17
   the jury's question prepared. If a representative from each
18
   side will approach, I have two copies of the proposed
19
   response to give you.
20
            I'll read my response into the record, and then
21
   I'll take comments from counsel for the parties with regard
22
   to the same. This is the response to Jury Note No. 1.
23
            Members of the jury, in response to your note,
24
   I am sending you the six specific exhibits which you
25
   requested, being:
```

```
GWX-482, GWX-493, GWX-494, GWX-484, GWX-389,
 1
 2
   GWX-490.
 3
            Additionally, and regarding your question for the,
   quote, Uncontested Facts Listing, close quote, I am sending
 4
   you Exhibit GWX-761, which is that document.
 5
 6
            Finally, as to your request for Dr. Crovella's
7
   testimony transcript, I cannot send that transcript to you.
            As I told you in my first set of instructions at
 8
 9
   the beginning of the trial, transcripts of witness testimony
   will not be available for you to view in the jury room while
10
11
   you deliberate.
12
            Consequently, you must rely on your memories of the
13
   evidence and testimony given by each witness during the
14
   trial.
15
            That's the Court's proposed response to be sent in
   together with the actual exhibits as identified.
16
17
            Does Plaintiff have any objection to that response?
18
            MR. GILLILAND: No objection, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Does Defendant?
19
20
            MR. BETTINGER: No, Your Honor.
21
            THE COURT: All right. Then I'll execute the
22
   original response and hand it, together with the actual
23
   exhibits, to the Court Security Officer, and direct that he
24
   deliver them to the jury in the jury room.
25
            With that, counsel, and pending either another note
```

```
from the jury or the return of a verdict, we stand in
1
 2
   recess.
 3
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
 4
            (Recess.)
 5
            (Jury out.)
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Be seated.
            Off the record.
 8
 9
            (Off the record discussion.)
            THE COURT: All right. Let's go back on the
10
11
   record.
12
            Counsel, the Court has received a second note from
13
   the jury. I have two copies for each side if you want to
14
   approach.
            I'll mark it as Item 2 in the upper right-hand
15
   corner. I'll read it into the record.
16
17
            Jurors, please request Pellegrino
18
   Patent No. 6,149,441. Thank you.
19
            Signed by Ms. Edwards, as foreperson.
20
            I'll hand the original note to Ms. Lockhart to be
   included in the papers of this case.
21
22
            It appears, counsel, that the exhibit they're
23
   asking for is GWX-122, the Pellegrino patent, the '441
24
   patent. I've already pulled that exhibit, and I've prepared
25
   a response that I've given you a copy of that effectively
```

```
1
   says:
 2
            In response to your note, attached is GWX-0122,
   which is the Pellegrino patent, Patent No. '441.
 3
            Any objection to me sending that response with the
 4
   exhibit itself to the jury in compliance with their request?
 5
 6
            MR. GILLILAND: No objection from the Plaintiff.
 7
            MR. BETTINGER: No objection, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: All right. I'll execute the written
 8
   response and ask the Court Security Officer to deliver it
   with the exhibit to the jury.
10
11
            And with that being completed, subject to either
12
   another note being received from the jury or the return of a
   verdict, we stand in recess.
13
14
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
15
            (Recess.)
16
            (Jury out.)
17
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
18
            THE COURT: Be seated, please.
19
            All right. Counsel, the Court's received the
20
   following note from the jury:
21
            We have reached a verdict.
            Signed by Ms. Nicole Edwards, as foreperson, and
22
23
   dated with today's date.
24
            I'll deliver the original note to the court
25
   security -- Courtroom Deputy to be included in the papers of
```

```
this case.
1
 2
            And I'll direct the Court Security Officer to bring
 3
   in the jury.
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise for the jury.
 4
            (Jury in.)
 5
            THE COURT: Please be seated.
 6
 7
            Ms. Edwards, I understand that you're the
   foreperson of the jury; is that correct?
 8
            THE FOREPERSON: Yes, sir.
            THE COURT: Has the jury reached a verdict?
10
11
            THE FOREPERSON: Yes, sir.
12
            THE COURT: Would you hand the completed verdict
   form to the Court Security Officer, who will bring it to me?
13
14
            Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm going to
   announce the verdict into the record at this time. I'm
15
16
   going to ask each member of the jury to listen very
17
   carefully, because after I have done that, I'm going to poll
18
   the jury to make sure that this is, in fact, the unanimous
   verdict of all eight members of the jury.
19
20
            Turning to the verdict form and beginning on
   Page 3 where Question 1 is found:
21
            Did Intellectual Ventures prove by a preponderance
22
23
   of the evidence that Great West has infringed Claim 14 of
24
   the '177 patent?
25
            The jury's answer is: Yes.
```

```
Turning to Page 4 of the verdict form where
 1
 2
   Question 2 is located:
 3
            Did Great West prove by clear and convincing
   evidence that Claim 14 of the '177 patent is invalid?
 4
            The jury's answer is: No.
 5
            Turning to Question 3 on Page 5 of the verdict
 6
7
   form:
            What sum of money, if any, paid now in cash do you
 8
   find by a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and
 9
   reasonably compensate Intellectual Ventures for the
10
11
   infringement by Great West of Claim 14 of the '177 patent?
12
            The jury's answer is: $1,500,000.00,
   $1,500,000.00.
13
14
            Turning next to Page 6, which is the last page of
15
   the verdict form, I find that it is dated with today's date,
16
   and it is signed by Ms. Edwards, as the foreperson of the
17
   jury.
18
            Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, let me poll you
   at this time to make sure this verdict unanimously reflects
19
20
   the decision of all eight members of the jury.
21
            If this is your verdict as I have read it, would
22
   you please stand?
23
            (Jury polled.)
24
            THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat.
25
            Let the record reflect that the jury -- all eight
```

members immediately stood and rose in response to the Court's question to poll the members of the jury with regard to the unanimous nature of this verdict.

The Court finds that this is the unanimous verdict of all eight members of the jury, and I'll deliver the original verdict to the Courtroom Deputy.

The Court accepts the jury's verdict in this case.

Ladies and gentlemen, this now completes the trial of this case. From the very beginning, I have repeatedly mentioned to you over and over about not discussing this case with anyone, including with yourselves, until you had heard all the evidence. I also gave you various other instructions.

I'm releasing you from all those instructions now.

At this point in time, you are free to discuss the case with anyone to whatever extent you would like to, you are also free not to discuss the case with anyone.

I want you to understand that it's been the practice in this district since I got out of law school, and that's a long time ago, that when a verdict is returned after a jury trial, the lawyers involved cannot initiate a conversation with the members of the jury about their service.

If you want to have a conversation with them, you will have to initiate it. And to facilitate that and to

encourage them not to camp out at the door of the courthouse so that you have to walk right by them when you leave the building in hopes that you'll stop and want to talk to them, I have secured four cell phone numbers, two from the Plaintiff's side and two from the Defendant's side. And I'm going to give you those in the jury room in a moment.

And if any of you would like to call any or all of the numbers listed there and talk about your service in this case, I guarantee you they'll all be happy to hear your comments and your suggestions and anything you have to say.

By the same token, ladies and gentlemen, if you do not wish to talk to any of the lawyers in this case about your service, you are not obligated to in any way. And if you're sure you don't want to do that, then just don't pick up a copy of those phone numbers when I make them available to you in the jury room. The decision it 100 percent yours and yours alone.

Now, with regard to other persons besides counsel that have been active in this case, again, it is your decision and your decision alone.

If as I suggested early on somebody on the first day met you at home when you came in and asked you what happened in federal court in Tyler, you can now answer those questions. You can now talk about it if you want to. But you're not obligated to.

That -- that is the practice that we've consistently and traditionally followed in this district and that's the practice we're going to follow in this case.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you as sincerely and as seriously as I can how much the Court appreciates your service in this case. This has been a sacrifice for every member of the jury to serve in this case. And everybody in this courtroom recognizes that.

Every one of you have had important things to do in your own respective lives over the last several days, and those matters have been put on hold so that you could serve as the jury in this case, and that is no small thing.

Quite honestly, ladies and gentlemen, without good citizens like yourselves being willing to present yourself and serve when selected and make the sacrifice that that requires, the court system would come to a standstill.

Our rights as Americans under the Seventh Amendment to the trial by jury in a civil case would effectively be lost if we didn't have citizens like you who would step up and respond appropriately and serve when called upon. You have done very, very real and important public service by serving on this jury. And it warrants recognition by the Court.

In fact, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask a favor of you at this point, and I do this in every jury

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you are excused.

```
trial where I've accepted the jury's verdict.
        I'm going to discharge you from your service as
jurors. And when I do that, you're free to leave.
        But rather than immediately get up and walk out of
the courthouse, if when I discharge you, if you would do me
a personal favor and go back to the jury room for just a few
minutes, I'd like to come into the jury room, and I'd like
to shake each hand, I'd like to look each one of you in the
eye and thank you by name for the service that you've
rendered, because, quite honestly, I believe it warrants
that, and it's that important.
        You're not required to do that, but if you would
afford me that privilege, I will not keep you very long, but
I think -- I think it's something that is warranted in this
case and in every case where a jury's made a sacrifice like
you have.
        If you if you will consider doing that, I would
consider it a very great privilege.
        With that, ladies and gentlemen, the Court accepts
the verdict, the Court discharges you as members of the jury
in this case, and if you will do me that privilege,
I will meet you in the jury room in just a minute.
        Counsel, that completes the trial of this case, and
```

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

```
(Jury out.)
 1
               (Court adjourned.)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability. /S/ Shelly Holmes 3/13/19 SHELLY HOLMES, CSR, TCRR Date OFFICIAL REPORTER State of Texas No.: 7804 Expiration Date: 12/31/20